

Date: Wed, 17 Nov 93 04:30:31 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #460
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 17 Nov 93 Volume 93 : Issue 460

Today's Topics:

No Code etc...

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 17 Nov 93 07:06:22 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: No Code etc...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CGLt46.M1A@butch.lmsc.lockheed.com> 103062@zuni.litc.lockheed.com
(Michael LeComte) writes:

> I have been reading this for a while and have avoided saying anything until
> now..

> I will not flame anyone or degrade anybody for their beliefs..

Maybe not, but you seem to make the attempt below.

> I have been licensed since 1980 and managed to get my General classed
> license at the age of 13.. This was when the FCC was still administering
> the tests.. Now I managed to pass the general theory and the 13Wpm code
> and it wasn't because I was smarter than anyone else.. I just had the desire
> to do it..

I got mine in 1963. So?

> I look at it this way when it comes to the Code.. I can handle the No-Code

>technician class.. I beleive it has it's place in the amateur radio community
>but I am sick and tired of people whining about the code.. Whether it is
>practical or impractical or narrow spectrum or wide spectrum really doesn't
>come into play.. The fact of the matter is that the code is a part of Ham
>radio that has been there since the start. It is a part of the heritage of Ham
>radio.. Part of what makes Ham Radio what it is is the fact that we have
>always maintained our heritage..

Nowhere in Part 97 does it say that a purpose of the amateur service is to preserve the past. If individuals want to preserve the heritage of the service, that's fine, but it's not the government's responsibility to limit access to the service in order to do so.

> Now for point 2.. I lived in L.A. long enough a while back to see what a
>disaster the repeaters can become with the misuse of Radio equipment.. Now the
>main reason in my eyes for the code is the fact that it is type of incentive
>program.. It weeds out people who are looking for the free ride.. Amateur
>radio is a service.. and a Hobby.. One of the things that has kept it
>productive for so long and kept it from turning into a babbling mass like
>C.B. has become is the fact that the code has kept that kind of trash out
>of Ham Radio..

Sorry this is just BS. Incentive licensing started in 1968. Prior to that the bands were relatively orderly. The problems you heard on the LA repeaters didn't start with the advent of a code test free license. They started in the 1970s when everyone still had to learn to beep beep. Code didn't cause the problem, code can't solve the problem. It was changes in society that were being mirrored in the amateur bands. The difference between amateur and CB operation is that hams *identify* themselves with their real callsigns and names while CBers hide behind anonymous handles. That practice is accepted on CB, it's violently opposed on amateur radio. People won't talk to you if you don't identify, people will hunt you down if you persist in not identifying. *That's* the difference between the services, not beep beep.

>That kind of persons excuse is just like I have seen on here
>lately.. "Well, All I wanna do is talk so why should I use code..?". Well
>the basics to that are .. If you just wanna talk buy a cell phone or a C.B.
>I figure it this way.. If you wanna drive.. You take the test the way it is
>and you don't complain.. So if you wanna be a ham.. Take the test and quit
>complaining..besides.. If you can't master a small coded form of communication
>then what would your excuse be of RTTY and AMTOR and PACKET.. Yes.. You can
>say "The Computer does it.." Well, then you are limiting yourself in the
>understanding area and turning into a feeble minded fool.. Maintain your
>brain and learn something PLEASE!!

Yes, do learn something please. Don't just depend on a conditioned

reflex response to beeps. Being a poor wetware modem is nothing to be proud of in a service that prides itself on staying on top of technology. Just as driving tests no longer require you to use a stick shift, amateur tests should no longer force you to do manually things best performed by mechanisms.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	If you wanna run cool,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	you gotta run on heavy,	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	heavy fuel.	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Mark Knoffler	

Date: 17 Nov 93 06:42:16 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov10.190719.14119@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Nov14.024306.9663@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <1993Nov15.225234.5487@Csl.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements

In article <1993Nov15.225234.5487@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>

>>SS holds great potential for several reasons. SS is highly resistant
>>to multipath.

>

>You have to trade off spectral efficiency for fade margin with spread spectrum,
>as with any other mode.

Selective fading and multipath are frequency dependent. By spreading the signal across a broad range of frequencies, selective fades and multipath effects are greatly reduced since only a minute part of the signal's energy is at the frequency of the null at any given time. Now it's true that an infinitely narrow signal can compensate by greatly increasing power during nulls, but those nulls are path specific, and the higher power still causes interference in other directions. So SS favors frequency reuse by allowing lower power levels in the presence of multipath.

>>SS offers faster information transfer than most narrow modes.

>

>Nothing allows you to exceed the Shannon Bound, including spread spectrum.

That's true, but the Shannon bound is a function of effective bandwidth, and SS has a larger effective bandwidth than most narrow modes.

>>SS is well suited to ALE techniques.

>

>As is any mode with a pilot or carrier.

Yes, which leaves out on/off keyed Morse.

>> SS allows graceful degradation of communications in the face of increasing spectrum loading. The latter is one of the more attractive virtues of SS.

>> No one's communication gets clobbered, rather everyone's communications sees a gradual S/N degradation as band loading increases.

>

>Again, this is not unique. On HF, as the load increases, ops tend to start overlapping their SSB channels, gradually degrading the existing communications in progress. Sure, there are idiot ops out there, just as there are bad systems engineers.

If narrow mode operators constantly monitored the entire band, and constantly adjusted in realtime to optimally fill the band, then their overlapping would be somewhat similar to what SS can do. Of course they don't. There's also a rather marked difference between a rise in the incoherent noise floor of a communications channel and the introduction of coherent interference. It's almost always easier to deal with gaussian noise than with coherent interference of varying amplitude and frequency.

>>Since SS *has* become a consumer technology, the costs of setting up a SS system have plummeted, and are likely to drop even further as cellular changes over to SS, and wireless lan products continue to proliferate.

>

>Okay, so when can I buy one? Not now? Fine. Then I *might* consider spending the money and changing the rules when I can, *and* when you've shown a unique benefit. Until then the change you've proposed isn't warranted.

Ah, a true appliance operator I see. Funny, I thought the rules were supposed to encourage the improvement of the radio art. I must be wrong, 97.1 doesn't exist, this is just an appliance operator's hobby like CB after all. It's just that the beeps sound a bit different, right Good Buddy?

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	If you wanna run cool,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	you gotta run on heavy,	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	heavy fuel.	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-Mark Knoffler	

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #460
